

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/801,617

03/08/2001

Sanaa F. Abdelhadi

AUS9-2000-0929-US1

8315

7590

06/07/2004

EXAMINER

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

Volel Emile

International Business Machines Corporation

Intellectual Property Law Department

11400 Burnet Road, Internal Zip 4054

Austin, TX 78758

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/801,617	Applicant(s) ABDELHADI ET AL.	
	Examiner Joshua D Campbell	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 03/08/2001.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, and 20 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings were received on 05/16/2001. These drawings are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-13, 15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Weiss et al. (hereinafter Weiss, US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0014415, filed on February 22, 2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, Weiss discloses a method in which a user may use a web browser to select to view only a portion of a hypertext document that is linked to a hyperlink in any received hypertext document (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-

0043 of Weiss). Weiss also discloses a method in which the portion is accessed and stored by a display station (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 of Weiss). Weiss also discloses a method which enables the user to select and display the portion of the linked document (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 of Weiss).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Weiss discloses a method in which a user may select to view the full document after viewing a portion of that document (Page 4, paragraphs 0092-0094 of Weiss).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Weiss discloses a method in which a user may select the size of the portion of the linked document to be viewed (Page 4, paragraphs 0081-0086 of Weiss).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Weiss discloses a method in which a user may use a web browser to select to view only a portion of a hypertext document that is linked to a hyperlink in any received hypertext document (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 of Weiss). Weiss also discloses a method in which the portion is accessed and stored by a display station (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 of Weiss). Weiss also discloses a method which enables the user to select and display the portion of the linked document (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 of Weiss).

Regarding independent claim 5 and dependent claims 6-8, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1-4. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1-4.

Regarding independent claim 9 and dependent claims 10-12, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 1-4. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 1-4.

Regarding independent claim 13, Weiss discloses a method in which a user at a display station can select to view only a portion of a web page and based on that selection the portion of the web page is accessed from the web and displayed (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 and Page 9, paragraphs 0190-0195 of Weiss).

Regarding independent claim 15, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 13. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 13.

Regarding independent claim 17, Weiss discloses a method in which a user at a display station can select to view only a portion of a web page and based on that selection the portion of the web page is accessed from the web and displayed (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 and Page 9, paragraphs 0190-0195 of Weiss).

Regarding independent claim 18, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 17. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 17.

Regarding independent claim 19, Weiss discloses a method in which a user may use a web browser to select to view only a portion of a hypertext document that is linked to a hyperlink in any received hypertext document (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 of Weiss). Weiss also discloses a method in which the portion is accessed and stored by a display station (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 of Weiss). Weiss also

discloses a method which enables the user to select and display the portion of the linked document (Page 2, paragraphs 0024-0043 of Weiss).

Regarding independent claim 20, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 19. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss et al. (hereinafter Weiss, US Patent Application Publication Number

2003/0014415, filed on February 22, 2001) as applied to claims 13 and 15 above, and further in view of Tracy et al. (hereinafter Tracy, US Patent Number 6,199,753, filed on November 4, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Weiss does not disclose a method in which a selected portion includes an incomplete image and that portion is accessed and displayed in text only mode. However, Tracy discloses a method in which a web page is displayed in text only format if there is not enough view space to properly display the images of the page in their entirety (column 11, lines 12-50 of Tracy). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the method of Weiss with the method of Tracy because it would have allowed more of the textual content to be displayed on a smaller area.

Regarding independent claim 16, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 14. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 14.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent Number 6,096,096

US Patent Number 6,366,923

US Patent Number 6,477,529

US Patent Application Publication 2002/0005867


Art Unit: 2178

US Patent Application Publication 2002/0129114

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (703)305-5764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703)308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

JDC
May 18, 2004